



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

author is striving after corrections of and additions to the text of Clement. We notice here with great satisfaction the correct text of the large Arethas scholion, so faultily published by Dindorf (1869; Praef., pp. xiv ff.).²—The third contribution is devoted to a study of Clement's use of the Septuagint. This subject has attracted editors and translators of Clement's works since Gentianus Hervetus, who wrote the first translation of and commentary to the great church father's work. The later results of Sylburg (1592) and Le Nourry (1703) were carefully used by J. Potter (1715), who himself made valuable additions. Later editors, Klotz (1831) and Dindorf, copied Potter most faultily and carelessly. Stählin gives on pp. 12–74 a long list of quotations from the LXX found in Clement, and discusses many of these. The results attained are rather negative, in general. None of the extant MSS. of the LXX text can be shown to have been used by Clement in his quotations; it can only be said: (1) that Clement is familiar with all the Old Testament books found in the LXX. The fact that some minor books are not quoted proves nothing. (2) No distinction is observed between canonical and deuterocanonical books.³ (3) In many quotations, especially from the prophetic books, Clement's text agrees with that of Theodotion and the other revisers. (4) Throughout there can be seen a difference between the Bible text of Clement and the text of Codex B.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien. Von Joseph Sickenberger. (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, N. F., VI, 1.) (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901; pp. viii + 268; M. 8.50.) This minute and laborious, yet valuable, work consists of two main parts: first, a series of text-critical studies of the commentary on Luke, which bears the name of Titus, bishop of Bostra; and, secondly, a critical edition of the genuine fragments which that commentary preserves, together with a few of the scholia on Daniel, which the editor thinks may also be accepted as genuine. Sickenberger confirms the opinion, long ago expressed, but not based upon any such

² Dindorf's edition was severely criticised by PAUL DE LAGARDE in the *Göttische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1870, pp. 801–24; republished in LAGARDE'S *Symptica* (1877), pp. 10–24. It was this scathing review which brought about an acquaintance between Stählin and that great Semitic and Septuagint scholar, whose influence one can detect in Stählin's admirable work.

³ In his quotations from the New Testament Clement appears to have drawn a distinction between canonical and apocryphal books. This, at least, is the opinion of KUTTER, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*, Giessen, 1897.

amount of scientific evidence as is here marshaled, that the so-called commentary of Titus on Luke is, in fact, a compilation. He shows that it was made in the sixth century, and that the chief homilists drawn upon, besides the real Titus, were Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Origen. Titus chose the favorite method of biblical exposition in the early church and cast his teaching into the form of homilies, which were written, probably, between 364 and 375 A. D. Why he should have won the distinction of having his name given to the whole commentary, rather than Cyril, who furnished a much larger share of the material, is not entirely clear. Our author believes that among the Milan manuscripts described by Mercati in 1898 there is a palimpsest fragment of one of the original homilies of Titus. But, speaking generally, we must arrive at the text through indirect means. The extensive introductory section contains some instructive remarks upon a different side of Titus's activity, viz., his work against the Manichæans, and attention is called to the new edition of his polemic, now being prepared by August Brinkmann, of Königsberg, and Ludwig Nix, a Privatdozent in Bonn.—JOHN WINTHROP PLATNER.

Abriss der Kirchengeschichte. Von Joh. Heinr. Kurtz. 15. Auflage. (Leipzig: August Neumann, 1901; pp. vi + 228; M. 2.20.) The fact that this little volume is now in the fifteenth edition shows that it has met a pressing need. Its general conception and arrangement are precisely the same as those of Kurtz's large church history in three volumes. Indeed, but for the fact of greater condensation, one feels that one is reading the larger work. It is a collection of the leading facts of church history clearly stated and tabulated, with no attempt at interpretative arrangement. Most of the statements are admirable in their comprehensiveness and lucidity; but occasionally, owing to the necessities of condensation, the statements are somewhat obscure: a fault perhaps impossible to avoid entirely in a work of this kind. The matter of proportion in general history is always a difficult one. In the case of the Germans it seems impossible for them to see that Calvin and the Genevan Reformation and the English Reformation were much more than sideshows. We see this when we compare Dr. Kurtz's account of the German Reformation with the accounts of those just mentioned. This book would go finely as a companion volume to Sohm's *Outlines of Church History*, to supply the facts, a knowledge of which is assumed in that masterly work.—*St. Augustine's Treatise on The City of God.* By F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock. (Lon-